

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended and claims 15-20 have been added as a result of this response. Claims 1 and 8 are independent claims.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) DOUGHER REJECTION

Claims 1-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,692,952 to Dougher et al. This rejection, in so far as it pertains to the pending claims, is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that the at least one protrusion protrudes "...outside a boundary defined by the second futon frame component." As clearly illustrated in at least Figs. 1, 2, and 4 of Dougher et al., the "protrusions" 42 and 43 of Dougher et al. do not protrude outside a boundary defined by the back 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable over Dougher et al. for at least this reason.

Applicants further respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-7 and 15-17 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claim 1, for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 8 is also allowable over Dougher et al, as well as dependent claims 9-14 and 18-20, dependent thereon.

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14 further emphasize the "drop-in" nature of the opening, slot, or track of the present invention. As is clearly recited in dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14, the at least one protrusion may be placed or dropped on an open track, where the open track is open in the direction of the drop-in, the at

least one protrusion rests on the top of the open track, or the top of the open track is exposed to allow the at least one protrusion to be placed thereon. Applicants respectfully submit that this is distinguishable from an opening, slot, or track which includes an upper portion, which prevents or impedes the protrusion from being lowered, dropped or placed on the opening, slot, or track from above. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14 are allowable for at least this additional reason.

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 15-20 further emphasize the type of protrusion and the manner in which the first and second futon frame components interact with one another. For example, as recited in dependent claims 15 and 18, the at least one protrusion is a roller. As clearly illustrated in Figs. 1, 2, and 4, of Dougher et al., slats 42 and 43 are not rollers. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 15 and 18 are allowable for at least this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-20 is respectfully requested.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants hereby petition for a two (2) month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the required \$450.00 extension fee herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John A. Castellano at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY & PIERCE, P.L.C

By: _____

John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

JAC/krf